ACFI-T14-15

The Higgs Seesaw Induced Neutrino Masses and Dark Matter

Yi Cai[1*] and Wei Chao[2,3†]

[1] *ARC Centre of Excellence for Particle Physics at the Terascale, School of Physics, The University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia*

[2] *Amherst Center for Fundamental Interactions, Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts-Amherst Amherst, MA 01003*

[3] *INPAC, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China*

arXiv:1408.6064v1 [hep-ph] 26 Aug 2014

Abstract

In this paper we propose a possible explanation of the active neutrino Majorana masses with the TeV scale new physics which also provide a dark matter candidate. We extend the Standard Model (SM) with a local $U(1)'$ symmetry and introduce a seesaw relation for the vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of the exotic scalar singlets, which break the $U(1)'$ spontaneously. The larger VEV is responsible for generating the Dirac mass term of the heavy neutrinos, while the smaller for the Majorana mass term. As a result active neutrino masses are generated via the modified inverse seesaw mechanism. The lightest of the new fermion singlets, which are introduced to cancel the $U(1)'$ anomalies, can be a stable particle with ultra flavor symmetry and thus a plausible dark matter candidate. We explore the parameter space with constraints from the dark matter relic abundance and dark matter direct detection.

* yi.cai@unimelb.edu.au

† chao@physics.umass.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

With the discovery of the Higgs-like scalar at the CERN LHC, the Standard Model Higgs mechanism for spontaneous breaking of the $SU(2)_{\rm L}\times U(1)_{\rm Y}$ gauge symmetry appears to be a correct description of the nature. In addition to explaining the spontaneous breaking of the electroweak symmetry, the Higgs boson is also responsible for the origin of fermion masses, via the Yukawa interactions. On the other hand, the minimal Higgs mechanism is not able to address the the fermion mass hierarchy problem, where the quark-lepton masses range from the top quark with mass of order electroweak scale, $M_t = 172$ GeV, down to electron of mass, $M_e = 0.511$ MeV, and the first order phase transition, relevant for baryon asymmetry of the Universe. More precise measurement of Higgs boson properties will help determine whether there are new degrees of freedom that participate in electroweak symmetry breaking or otherwise involve in new Higgs boson interactions.

Furthermore, the discovery of the neutrino oscillation has confirmed the theoretical expectation that neutrinos are massive and lepton flavors are mixed [1], which provided the first piece of evidence for physics beyond the Standard Model (SM). In order to accommodate the tiny neutrino masses, one can extend the SM by introducing several right-handed neutrinos, which are taken to be singlets under the $SU(2)_{\rm L}\times U(1)_{\rm Y}$ gauge group. In this case, the gauge invariance allows right-handed neutrinos to have Majorana mass M_R, which is not subject to the electroweak symmetry breaking scale. Thus the effective mass matrix of three light Majorana neutrinos can be highly suppressed if M_R is much larger than the electroweak scale, which is the so-called canonical seesaw mechanism [2]. Two other types of tree-level seesaw mechanisms have also been proposed [3, 4]. Despite its simplicity and elegance, the canonical seesaw mechanism is impossible to be tested in current collider experiments, especially at the Large Hadron Collider, due to its inaccessibly high right-handed Majorana mass scale. Heavy Majorana neutrinos can also give large radiative corrections to the SM Higgs mass, which causes the seesaw hierarchy problem [5]. An alternative way to generate tiny Majorana neutrino masses at the TeV scale is the inverse seesaw mechanism [6, 7], in which the neutrino mass m_ν is proportional to a small effecitive Majorana mass term μ. But there is no dynamical explanation of the smallness of μ. The argument is that neutrinos become massless in the limit of vanishing μ and the global lepton number, $U(1)_{\rm L}$, is then restored, leading to a larger symmetry [8]. This argument, however, only

works when we give the left-handed singlets (S_L) the same quantum(lepton) number as that of the right-handed heavy neutrinos (N_R). If the lepton number of S_L is zero, the argument above does not hold up any more. Besides, the lepton number is only an accidental symmetry of the SM and is explicitly broken by anomalies.

Since neutrino is the only neutral matter field in the SM, it is reasonable to conjecture that neutrinos are correlated with the dark matter, which provides another evidence of the new physics beyond the SM from the precise cosmological observations, through certain dark symmetry. The nature of the dark matter and the way it interacts with ordinary matter are still mysteries. The discovery of the Higgs boson opens up new ways of probing the world of the dark matter. The neutrino flux from the annihilation of the dark matter at the center of the dark matter halo also provides a way of indirect detecting the dark matter.

In this paper, we propose a possible explanation of the smallness of neutrino masses and a possible candidate of the dark matter. The discovery of the Higgs-like boson makes the Higgs mechanism more promising as a possible way to understand the origin of the fermion masses. We study the possibility of generating a small Majorana mass term with the help of the seesaw mechanism in the Higgs sector. We extend the SM with a local $U(1)'$ gauge symmetry, which is spontaneously broken by the vacuum expectation value (VEV) $\langle\varphi\rangle$ of an extra scalar singlet. Furthermore there is a seesaw mechanism in the scalar singlet sector: a second scalar singlet gets a tiny VEV $\langle\Phi\rangle$ in a way similar to that of the Higgs triplet in the type-II seesaw model [3]. $\langle\varphi\rangle$ is responsible for the origin of the dark matter mass and the Dirac neutrino mass term, while $\langle\Phi\rangle$ is responsible for the origin of a small Majorana neutrino mass term. The active neutrino mass matrix arises from the modified inverse seesaw mechanism. A crucial feature of our model is that all the mass terms originate from the spontaneous breaking of local gauge symmetries, and dark matter is correlated with the neutrino physics via the $U(1)'$ gauge symmetry. We study constraints on the parameter space of this model from astrophysical observation and dark matter direct detections.

The paper is organized as follows: In section II we describe our model, including the full Lagrangian, Higgs VEVs and mass spectrum. In section III we study the neutrino masses and the effective lepton mixing matrix of the model. Section IV is devoted to the study of the dark matter phenomenology. We summarize in section V.

II. THE MODEL

We extend the SM with three generations of right-handed neutrinos N_R and singlets S_L as in the inverse seesaw mechanism, together with two extra scalar singlets, φ and Φ, as well as a spontaneously broken $U(1)'$ gauge symmetry and a global $U(1)_D$ flavor symmetry. The quantum numbers of the fields are given in Table I, where ℓ_L is left-handed lepton doublet, E_R is the right-handed charged lepton, H is the SM Higgs doublet, and χ_L and χ_R are the fermion singlet pair carrying the same $U(1)_D$ quantum number. Three generations of gauge singlets $\chi_{L,R}$ are needed to cancel anomalies [9–15] of the $U(1)'$ gauge symmetry. The lightest generation of $\chi_{L,R}$ is stable due to the global $U(1)_D$ flavor symmetry and thus plays the role of dark matter [30–32].

	ℓ_L	E_R	N_R	S_L	χ_R	χ_L	H	φ	Φ
$U(1)'$	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
$U(1)_D$	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0

TABLE I: Quantum numbers of the relevant fields under the local $U(1)'$ and the global $U(1)_D$ flavor symmetry.

The Higgs potential of the model can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} V =& -m^2 H^\dagger H - m_1^2 \varphi^\dagger \varphi + m_2^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \lambda (H^\dagger H)^2 + \lambda_1 (\varphi^\dagger \varphi)^2 + \lambda_2 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \\ & + \lambda_3 (H^\dagger H)(\varphi^\dagger \varphi) + \lambda_4 (H^\dagger H)(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) + \lambda_5 (\varphi^\dagger \varphi)(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) \\ & + \sqrt{2}\lambda_6 \left(\Lambda \varphi^2 \Phi + \text{h.c.} \right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where we define $H = (h^+,\ (h_0 + iA + v)/\sqrt{2})^T$, $\varphi = (\varphi_0 + i\delta + v_1)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\Phi = (\Phi_0 + i\rho + v_2)/\sqrt{2}$. After imposing the conditions of the global minimum, one has

$$-m^2 v + \lambda v^3 + \frac{1}{2} v (\lambda_3 v_1^2 + \lambda_4 v_2^2) = 0 \ , \tag{2}$$

$$-m_1^2 v_1 + \lambda_1 v_1^3 + \frac{1}{2} v_1 (\lambda_3 v^2 + \lambda_5 v_2^2) + 2\lambda_6 \Lambda v_2 = 0 \ , \tag{3}$$

$$+m_2^2 v_2 + \lambda_2 v_2^3 + \frac{1}{2} v_2 (\lambda_4 v^2 + \lambda_5 v_1^2) + \lambda_6 \Lambda v_1^2 = 0 \ . \tag{4}$$

Then the VEVs can be solved in terms of the parameters

$$v^2 \approx \frac{2m_1^2 \lambda_3 - 4m^2 \lambda_1}{\lambda_3^2 - 4\lambda_1 \lambda} \ , \qquad v_1^2 \approx \frac{2m^2 \lambda_3 - 4m_1^2 \lambda}{\lambda_3^2 - 4\lambda\lambda_1} \ , \qquad v_2 \approx -\frac{2\lambda_6 \Lambda v_1^2}{2m_2^2 + \lambda_4 v^2 + \lambda_5 v_1^2} \ , \tag{5}$$

where v_2 is proportional to Λ and suppressed by m_2^2. Thus v_2 can be a small value given a large m_2^2 or small Λ.

In the basis $(h_0,\ \phi_0,\ \Phi_0)$, the mass matrix of the CP-even Higgs can be written as

$$M^2_{\rm CPeven} = \begin{pmatrix} 2v^2\lambda & vv_1\lambda_3 & vv_2\lambda_4 \\ vv_1\lambda_3 & 2\lambda_1 v_1^2 & 2\Lambda v_1\lambda_6 \\ vv_2\lambda_4 & 2\Lambda v_1\lambda_6 & 2v_2^2\lambda_2 - \lambda_6\Lambda v_1^2 v_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{6}$$

The mass eigenstates of the CP-even Higgs are then denoted as h_i including the SM-like Higgs h and two exotic Higgs, h_1 and h_2. There is no mixing between the SM CP-odd Higgs A, which is the Goldstone boson eaten by the Z gauge boson, and those of the Higgs singlets, i.e. δ and ρ. The mass matrix of the CP-odd Higgs singlets in the basis of (δ, ρ) is

$$M^2_{\rm CP-odd} = \begin{pmatrix} -4\Lambda v_2\lambda_6 & 2\Lambda v_1\lambda_6 \\ 2\Lambda v_1\lambda_6 & -\Lambda\lambda_6 v_1^2 v_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{7}$$

The massless eigenstate of the eq. (7) is the Goldstone boson eaten by the Z' and the nonzero mass eigenstate of the CP-odd scalar is then denoted as A', the mass squared of which can be written as $m^2_{A'} = -4(v_2 + v_1^2 v_2^{-1})\Lambda\lambda_6$.

Since the SM particles are not charged under $U(1)'$, there is no experimental constraint on the new symmetry. Besides, there is no tree-level mixing between Z and Z'. Thus the mass and coupling constant of Z' are not constrained by current experiments either.

III. NEUTRINO MASSES

Now we investigate how to realize the neutrino masses in our model. The Yukawa interactions of the lepton sector can be given by

$$-\mathcal{L} = \overline{\ell_L} Y_E H E_R + \overline{\ell_L} Y_\nu \tilde{H} N_R + \overline{S_L} Y_N \varphi N_R + \overline{S_L} Y_S \Phi S_L^C + \overline{\chi_L} Y_\chi \varphi \chi_R + \text{h.c.} \tag{8}$$

where the first and second terms are the charged lepton and neutrino Yukawa interactions separately, the third and fourth terms are the Yukawa coupling of heavy neutrinos to the scalar singlets, and the last term is the Yukawa coupling of the additional fermions. We assume that there is no $\overline{N_R^C} M N_R$ type of mass term, which can be easily forbidden by an extra global $U(1)$ symmetry, in which all the right-handed fermions, H and S_L are singly charged, Φ doubly charged and all other particles neutral. The symmetry is explicitly broken

by the last term of the Higgs potential in Eq. (1). We can write down the mass matrix of neutrinos in the basis $(\nu_L, N_R^C, S_L)^T$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y_\nu v & 0 \\ Y_\nu^T v & 0 & Y_N v_1 \\ 0 & Y_N^T v_1 & Y_S v_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

where v, v_1, v_2 are given in Eq. (5). Given $v_1 \sim 1\ TeV$ and $v_2 \sim 1\ MeV$, the inverse seesaw mechanism is naturally realized. The matrix $\mathcal{M}$ can be diagonalized by the unitary transformation $\mathcal{U}^\dagger \mathcal{M} \mathcal{U}^* = \hat{\mathcal{M}}$; or explicitly,

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ D & E & F \\ G & H & I \end{pmatrix}^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y_\nu v & 0 \\ Y_\nu^T v & 0 & Y_N v_1 \\ 0 & Y_N^T v_1 & Y_S v_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ D & E & F \\ G & H & I \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{M}_\nu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{M}_N & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{M}_S \end{pmatrix} , \tag{10}$$

where $\hat{M}_{\nu,N,S}$ are 3×3 diagonal matrices. The nine mass eigenstates correspond to three observed light neutrinos $\hat{\nu}$ and six heavy Majorana neutrinos $\hat{S}$ and $\hat{N}$, which pair up to form three pseudo-Dirac neutrinos.

Alternatively, the neutrino mass matrix can be block diagonalized and the effective Majorana mass matrix of the active neutrinos can be approximately written as

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = M_D M_R^{-1} \mu M_R^{T-1} M_D^T = v^2 v_1^{-2} v_2 Y_\nu Y_N^{-1} Y_S Y_N^{T-1} Y_\nu^T \ . \tag{11}$$

The mass eigenvalues of the three pairs of heavy neutrinos are of the order M_R, and the mixing between $SU(2)_L$ singlets and doublets is suppressed by M_D/M_R. In the basis where the flavor eignestates of the three charged leptons are identified with their mass eigenstates, the charged-current interactions between neutrinos and charged leptons turn out to be

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\rm CC} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{\ell_L^\alpha} \gamma_\mu P_L \left(A_{\alpha i} \hat{\nu}_i + B_{\alpha i} \hat{N}_i + C_{\alpha i} \hat{S}_i \right) + \text{h.c.} \ . \tag{12}$$

Obviously A describes the charged-current interactions of light Majorana neutrinos, while B and C are relevant to the charged currents of heavy neutrinos. The neutral current interactions between Majorana neutrinos and neutral gauge boson or Higgs can be also written down in a similar way.

The explicit expression of A can be obtained by integrating out heavy neutrinos and performing the normalization to the light neutrino wave functions. So the effective lepton-mixing matrix can be written as

$$A_{\alpha i} = \left(\delta_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \left| M_D M_R^{-1} \mu (M_R^T)^{-1} \right|^2_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \left| M_D M_R^{-1} \right|^2_{\alpha\beta} \right) U_{\beta i} \ , \tag{13}$$

where U is the standard PMNS matrix. Obviously the effective neutrino mixing matrix is not unitary. The deviation of A from a unitary matrix is proportional to $|M_D M_R^{-1}|^2$. Constraints on the elements of the leptonic mixing matrix, combining data from neutrino oscillation experiments and weak decays was studied in Ref. [16] . So far neutrino mixing angles have all been measured to a good degree of accuracy, and a preliminary hint for a nontrivial value of δ has also been obtained from a global analysis of current neutrino oscillation data. But the constraint on the non-unitarity of the lepton mixing matrix still need to be improved and the future neutrino factory can measure this effect through the "zero-distance" effect and extra CP violations. The Daya Bay [17] reactor neutrino experiment has measured a nonzero value for the neutrino mixing angle θ_{13} with a significance of 5.2 standard deviations. For this case, even though the neutrino mixing matrix U, which diagonalizes the active neutrino mass matrix, takes the well-known lepton mixing pattens, such as Tri-Bimaximal [18] , Bimaximal [19] and Democratic [20] pattens, where θ_{13} is exactly zero, it is still possible to get relatively large θ_{13} from the non-unitarity factors in eq. (13) [21]. One can also check the non-unitary effect from the lepton-flavor-violating SM Higgs decays, which, interesting and important but beyond the scope of this paper, will be shown somewhere else.

IV. DARK MATTER

Precise cosmological observations have confirmed the existence of the non-baryonic cold dark matter. The lightest generation of $\chi_{L,R}$, the only odd particles under the global $U(1)$ symmetry, can be a stable dark matter candidate. In order to produce the dark matter relic abundance observed today $\Omega_{DM}h^2 = 0.1187 \pm 0.017$ [22], the thermally averaged annihilation rate $\sigma_A v$ should approximately be $3 \times 10^{-27} cm^3 s^{-1}/\Omega_{DM}h^2$. Interactions relevant to dark matter phenomenology can be written as

$$\text{I} \quad . \qquad \bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu P_R \chi Z'_\mu \,, \tag{14}$$

$$\text{II} \quad . \qquad \overline{\nu_L^C} F^2 \gamma^\mu Z'_\mu \nu_L^C \,, \tag{15}$$

$$\text{III} \; . \qquad Y_\chi/\sqrt{2}\bar{\chi}_L(\cos\theta h_1 - \sin\theta h)\chi_R \,, \tag{16}$$

where θ is the mixing angle between the SM Higgs boson and the Higgs singlet. It's the 1-2 mixing angle of matrix given in Eq. (6). F is either D or G, the 21 and 31 entry in $\mathcal{U}$. The



FIG. 1: Feynman diagrams relevant for the annihilations of the dark matter

expressions of D and G can be written as

$$G \approx (M_R^{-1})^* M_D^\dagger U \ , \tag{17}$$

$$D \approx (M_R^*)^{-1} \mu^\dagger (M_R^\dagger)^{-1} M_D^\dagger \ , \tag{18}$$

from which it's easily seen that the active neutrinos mainly mix with S_L, while the mixing with N_R^C is highly suppressed by the factor μM_R^{-1}. The major contributions to the annihilation cross section come from two types of channels,

$$\chi\bar{\chi} \to Z' \to 2\nu \qquad \chi\bar{\chi} \to h_i \to 2X, \tag{19}$$

where X represents the SM fields including h_i but other than neutrinos. The relevant Feynman diagrams for dark matter annihilation are given in Fig. 1. Obviously the dark matter in our model is the hybrid of neutrino portal and Higgs portal.

To investigate the viability of this model of providing a good dark matter candidate, we fix those parameters irrelevant to the dark matter properties and vary the others. Without loss of generality we also simplify the calculation by taking diagonal Yukawa coupling matrices, which are relevant for the generation of neutrino mixing but irrelevant for the dark matter phenomenology. The typical input parameters are given in the table. II. The relics density and direct detection cross section are calculated with *micrOMEGAs*[26], which solves the Boltzmann equations numerically and utilizes *CalcHEP* [27] to calculate the relevant cross section. We show in the left panel of Fig.2 the contour plot of λ_3 as a function of (λ_H, λ_1) with $m_h = 120, 126$ GeV . The approximate range for λ_3 is roughly $(0, 5, 1.5)$ for value chosen in Table. II. We also show in the right panel of Fig.2 the contour plot of the CP-even exotic Higgs mass M_{h_1} as a function of (λ_H, λ_1) with the SM-like Higgs mass fixed at 126 GeV, which shows that the mass of the exotic CP-even Higgs is in the range of $300 - 700$ GeV.

Fig. 3 shows the major contributions of various channels to the dark matter annihilation for different parameters. Fig. 3a is for $M_Z' = 200$ GeV and fig. 3b is for $M_Z' = 1$ TeV.



FIG. 2: Left panel: Contour plot of λ_3 as a function of (λ_H, λ_1) which gives a Higgs mass of 126(120) GeV in solid(dashed) lines. The approximate range for λ_3 is roughly between 0.5 and 1.5 for value chosen in Table. II. Right panel: Contour plot of the mass of h_1 as a function of (λ_H, λ_1) which gives the right SM-like Higgs mass.

parameters	values or range	parameters	values or range
m_1^2/GeV	5.0×10^4	m_2^2/GeV	1.0×10^6
$Y_\nu,\ Y_N$	0.5	Y_S	0.5
$\lambda_H,\ \lambda_1$	$(\ 0,\ \sqrt{4\pi}\ ]$	$\lambda_2,\ \lambda_4,\ \lambda_5$	0.5
$M_{Z'}$/GeV	$200, 1000$	M_χ/GeV	$[\ 10,\ 2000]$

TABLE II: Input parameters at the benchmark point. The parameters in the right part of the table do not change the DM relic density. λ_3 is calculated by imposing the condition $M_h = 126$ GeV. The choice of parameter space ensures v_1 is of TeV and v_2 is of GeV to generate the right neutrino mass scale.

For $M_\chi \lesssim M_W$, the dark matter pair annihilate mostly into quark and lepton pairs, the amplitude of which is suppressed by the Yukawa couplings. As a result, the dark matter relic abundance for $M_\chi \lesssim M_b$ will be too big to be consistent with the observation. For $M_W \lesssim M_\chi \lesssim M_h$, the dominant channels are $\chi\bar{\chi} \to W^+W^-$ and $\chi\bar{\chi} \to ZZ$. When M_χ gets even bigger, $\chi\bar{\chi} \to hh$ and $\chi\bar{\chi} \to h_1h_1$ are no longer kinematically forbidden and becomes the dominant annihilation channel. While for $M_\chi > 1/2(M_{h1} + M_{Z'})$, $\chi\bar{\chi} \to h_1Z'$ becomes



(a) (b)

FIG. 3: Relative contributions of different channels to Ω_χ^{-1} as a function of dark matter mass shown in % for $M_{Z'} = 200$ GeV (left) and $M_{Z'} = 1000$ GeV (right) with $\lambda_H = \lambda_1 = 1.0$ and other values taken according to Table II. The channels with less important contributions are not plotted here.

the dominate annihilation channel of the dark matter. For the two examples shown in Fig. 3, the model on the left panel has too big an annihilation cross section which is excluded and the one on the right will produce the right amount of dark matter given $M_\chi \sim 30$ GeV.

Dark matter is also constrained by direct detection experiments such as LUX [28] and XENON 100[29]. The dark matter -quark interactions in the effective models naturally induce the dark matter-nucleus interactions. The effective Hamiltonian in our model can be written as

$$H_{\rm eff} = \sum_q c_\theta s_\theta \frac{m_\chi}{v_1}(\bar{\chi}\chi)\left(\frac{1}{M_h^2} - \frac{1}{M_{h1}^2}\right)\frac{m_q}{v}\bar{q}q\ , \tag{20}$$

where $c_\theta = \cos\theta$ and $s_\theta = \sin\theta$. Parameterizing the nucleonic matrix element as $\langle N \sum_q m_q \bar{q}q\rangle = f_N m_N$, where m_N is the proton or neutron mass and f_N are the nucleon form factors. We refer to [30–32] for explicit values of $f^{p,n}$. The cross section for the DM scattering elastically from a nucleus is given by

$$\sigma^{\rm SI} = \frac{\mu^2}{\pi}\left[\frac{c_\theta s_\theta m_\chi}{v v_1}\left(\frac{1}{M_h^2} - \frac{1}{M_{h1}^2}\right)\right]^2 [Z m_p f^p + (A-Z) m_n f^n]^2 \tag{21}$$

where $\mu = m_\chi m_N/(m_\chi + m_N)$ is the reduced mass of the WIMP-nucleon system, with m_N the target nucleus mass. Z and $(A-Z)$ are the numbers of protons and neutrons in the nucleus. Fig. 4 shows the spin-independent nucleon direct detection cross section as a function of the



FIG. 4: Spin-independent nucleon direct detection cross section as a function of the dark matter mass, where the blue and black points are models with $M_{Z'} = 200$ GeV and $M_{Z'} = 1000$ GeV respectively. The red solid line is the LUX limit.

dark matter mass, where the blue and black points are models with $M_{Z'} = 200$ GeV and $M_{Z'} = 1000$ GeV respectively. The red solid line is the LUX limit. One can see from (21) that the scattering cross section is sensitive to λ_3, which determines the mixing angle, θ, between the SM-like Higgs and the Heavier scalar singlet. The direct detection cross section gets bigger when λ_3 increases.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we extend the SM with a local and a global $U(1)$ symmetry. The smallness of active neutrino Majorana masses is explained by the modified inverse seesaw mechanism. Extra fermion singlets introduced to cancel anomalies of the model can play the role of dark matter. Constraints on the model parameter space from dark matter relic density as well as dark matter direct searches are studied. All the fermion masses arise from the spontaneous breaking of local gauge symmetries, which is a very appealing feature of the model in the era of Higgs physics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Y. C. was supported in part by Australian Research Council. W. C. was supported in part by DOE Grant DE-SC0011095

---

[1] K. Nakamura, *et al.*, (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **37**, 075021 (2010).

[2] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977); T. Yanagida, in *Workshop on Unified Theories*, KEK report 79-18 p.95 (1979); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, R. Slansky, in *Supergravity* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen, D. Freedman, p.315; S. L. Glashow, in *1979 Cargese Summer Institute on Quarks and Leptons* (Plenum Press, New York, 1980) eds. M. Levy, J.-L. Basdevant, D. Speiser, J. Weyers, R. Gastmans and M. Jacobs, p.687; R. Barbieri, D. V. Nanopoulos, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, Phys. Lett. B **90**, 91 (1980); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980); G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **181**, 287 (1981).

[3] W. Konetschny and W. Kummer, Phys. Lett. B **70**, 433 (1977); T. P. Cheng and L. F. Li, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2860 (1980); G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **181**, 287 (1981); J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2227 (1980); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 165 (1981).

[4] R. Foot, H. Lew, X. G. He and G. C. Joshi, Z. Phys. C **44**, 441 (1989).

[5] A. Abada, C. Biggo, F. Bonnet, M. B. Gavela and T. Hambye, JHEP **0712**, 061 (2007).

[6] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 1642 (1986).

[7] H. An, P. S. Bhupal Dev, Y. Cai and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 081806 (2012).

[8] G. 't Hooft, *Lecture given at Cargese Summer Inst.,* Cargese, France, Aug 26-Sep-8, 1979.

[9] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. B **177**, 324(1982)

[10] S. L. Adler, Phys. Rev. **177**, 2426(1969).

[11] J. S. Bell and R. Jackiw, Nuovo Cimento A **60**, 47(1969).

[12] W. A. Barden, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1848(1969).

[13] R. Delbourgo and A. Salam, Phys. Lett. B **40**, 381(1972).

[14] T. Eguchi and P. G. O. Freund, Phys. Rev. Lett **37**, 1251(1976).

[15] L. Alvarez-Gaume and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **234**, 269(1984).

[16] S. Antusch, C. Biggio, E. Fernadez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela and J. Lopez-Pavon, JHEP **0610** , 084 (2006).

[17] F. P. An *et al.* [DAYA-BAY Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012) [arXiv:1203.1669 [hep-ex]].

[18] P.F. Harrison, D.H. Perkins, and W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B458**, 79 (1999); Phys. Lett. **B530**, 167 (2002); Z.Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B533**, 85 (2002); P.F. Harrison and W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B535**, 163 (2002); Phys. Lett. **B557**, 76 (2003); X.-G. He and A. Zee, Phys. Lett. **B560**, 87 (2003); See also L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 958 (1978); Y. Yamanaka, H. Sugawara, and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. **D25**, 1895 (1982); **D29**, 2135(E) (1984); N. Li and B.-Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 017302 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0412126].

[19] F. Vissani, hep-ph/9708483; V.D. Barger, S.Pakvasa, T.J. Weiler, and K. Whisnant, Phys. Lett. **B437**, 107 (1998); A.J. Baltz, A.S. Goldhaber, and M. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5730 (1998); I. Stancu and D.V. Ahluwalia, Phys. Lett. **B460**, 431 (1999); H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, Phy. Rev. **D61**, 097301 (2000); N. Li and B.-Q. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **600**, 248 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0408235].

[20] H. Fritzsch and Z. Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **372**, 265 (1996); Phys. Lett. B **440**, 313 (1998); Phys. Rev. D **61**,073016 (2000).

[21] W. Chao and Y. j. Zheng, JHEP **1302**, 044 (2013) [arXiv:1107.0738 [hep-ph]].

[22] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].

[23] S. Kanemura, T. Nabeshima and H. Sugiyama, arXiv:1111.0599; Wei Chao, Phys. Lett. B **695**, 157 (2011); J. Chankrabortty, arXiv:1003.3154; W. Chao, Phys. Rev. D **82** , 016008 (2010); F. M. L. de Almeida *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D bf 81, 053005 (2010); H. Zhang and S. Zhou, Phys. Lett. B **685**, 297 (2010); P. S. B. Dev and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 013001 (2010); Z. Z. Xing and S. Zhou, Phys. Lett. B **679**, 249 (2009); A. Ibarra, E. Molinaro and S. T. Pectov, JHEP **1009**, 108 (2010); W. Chao, Z. Si Y. J. Zheng and S. Zhou, Phys. Lett. B **683**, 26 (2010); W. Chao, arXiv: 0806.0889; W. Chao, Z. Si, Z. Z. Xing and S. Zhou, Phys. Lett. B **666**, 451 (2008); W. Chao, S. Luo, Z. Z. Xing and S. Zhou, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 016001 (2008).

[24] M. C. Chen and J. Huang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **26**, 1147 (2011).

[25] D. A. Sierra, M. Hirsch and S. G. Kovalenko, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 055011 (2008); I. Dorsner and P. F. Perez, Nucl. Phys. B **723**, 53 (2005); P. F. Perez, T. Han, T. Li and R. M. Ramsey-

Musolf, Nucl. Phys. B **819**, 139 (2009); C. K. Chua, X. G. He and W. Y. P. Huang, Phys. Rev. D **479**, 224 (2000); U. Mahanta, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 073009 (2000); K. S. Babu and J. Julio, Nucl. Phys. B **841**, 130 (2010).

[26] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov and A. Semenov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **176** (2007) 367; G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, P. Brun, A. Pukhov, S. Rosier-Lees, P. Salati and A. Semenov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **182** (2011) 842.

[27] A. Belyaev, N. D. Christensen and A. Pukhov, arXiv:1207.6082 [hep-ph]; http://theory.sinp.msu.ru/ pukhov/calchep.html.

[28] D. S. Akerib *et al.* [LUX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 091303 (2014) [arXiv:1310.8214 [astro-ph.CO]].

[29] XENON 100 Collaboration, E. Aprile *et al.*, Dark matter results from 100 live days of XENON 100 data, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 131302 (2011).

[30] G. Bertone, D. Hooper and J. Silk, Phys. Rept. **405**, 279 (2005).

[31] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, Phys. Rept. **267**, 195 (1996)

[32] G. Bertone and (ed.), *Particle dark matter: Observations, models and searches.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.